The Exclusion of Musical Instruments from the Ancient Synagogue
Author(s): James W. McKinnon
Source: *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, Vol. 106 (1979 - 1980), pp. 77-87
Published by: Taylor & Francis, Ltd. on behalf of the Royal Musical Association
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/765928
Accessed: 22/01/2011 18:04

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=rma.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Royal Musical Association and *Taylor & Francis, Ltd.* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association.*

http://www.jstor.org

The Exclusion of Musical Instruments from the Ancient Synagogue

JAMES W. McKINNON

WE are remarkably well-informed about the liturgy of the Second Temple at Jerusalem in the years which preceded its destruction by the Romans in AD 70; the same is not the case, as will be seen below, with the contemporary Synagogue. The central source of our knowledge about Temple liturgy is the Talmud, that massive compendium of rabbinic learning and lore which had its first redaction in the Mishnah of about AD 200. There are numerous remarks on Temple liturgy scattered throughout the sixty-three tractates of the Mishnah, but two in particular give us as detailed a description of its daily services as do the *ordines romani* of the seventh-century Roman pontifical Mass. These are the tractates Middoth, literally measurements, which gives a description of the Temple with its dimensions, and Tamid, literally perfect or perpetual, which goes step by step through the daily sacrificial rites.

The musical portion of the service came at its climax. It consisted in the singing by the Levite musicians of the proper psalm for the day[1] as the sacrificial lamb was consumed on the altar fire and the libation of wine was being poured out. The limbs of the lamb had just been cast upon the fire, and two priests gave three blasts on their silver trumpets, a *teki'ah*, a *teru'ah*, and a *teki'ah*, that is, a plain, a broken, and a plain blast. The High Priest's deputy, the *Segan*, waved a cloth and the Temple official who was 'over the cymbals' clashed them together. Then as the libation was poured out the Levites sang the psalm of the day from a platform, the *duchan*, situated near the people at the eastern end of the inner Temple court. They accompanied themselves with *nebel* and *kinnor*, string instruments which in all probability can be identified with harp and kithara respectively.[2] How many musicians were involved? The Mishnah 'Arakin tells us that they played 'on no less than two harps nor more than six', and again that there were 'no less than nine kitharas and they could be increased unto infinity, but there was only one cymbal', and finally that 'there were no less than twelve Levites standing on the platform and they could be increased unto infinity'.[3] It is not clear whether these twelve were to include the previously mentioned instrumentalists or not, but in any case twelve was the absolute minimum of musicians the Mishnah deemed appropriate for the daily psalm. In addition to this there was a provision that young people be allowed to stand beside the platform and join the Levites in singing, but not in playing.[4] The psalm was performed in a manner peculiarly adapted to its function as accompaniment to the sacrifice. After each section (*pereq*)[5] of the psalm the trumpets sounded a *teki'ah* and the people prostrated themselves. With the singing of the psalm the regular morning service came to a close.

A number of special musical practices associated with the various festivals bear mention. Chief among these was the singing of the *Hallel*, Psalms 113–118,

which have Alleluia as a refrain. The *Hallel* was sung in the Temple on about twelve days of the year,[6] and coincidentally the *halil* was played on these same joyous occasions.[7] The *halil* was a wind instrument, probably of the aulos type;[8] no less than two and no more than twelve were to be employed.[9] Unfortunately the Talmud is insufficiently explicit as to the relationship of these additional instruments either to the singing of the *Hallel* or to the ordinary Levitical instruments. It is probably safe to assume, however, that on at least one occasion the *halilin* were added to the other instruments during the singing of the *Hallel*: this was at the repeated singing of the *Hallel* which accompanied the slaughter of the paschal lambs.[10]

Once during the year, after the first day of *Sukkah*, the festival of booths, the people gathered in the outer Temple court for a night of singing and dancing to firelight. A prominent feature of the celebration was the singing by the Levites of the fifteen gradual psalms, Psalms 120–134, as they stood upon the fifteen semi-circular steps which led through the Nicanor Gate to the inner court; according to the Mishnah Sukkah, 'Levites without number' played upon 'harps, kitharas, cymbals and trumpets and other musical instruments'.[11] Finally, the shofar figured prominently in the services of *Rosh Hashanah*, the New Year.[12] To all appearances it was the only musical instrument, if it can be properly so called, to survive in liturgical usage after the destruction of the Second Temple.

* * *

Music historians have long since made note of the contrast between the elaborate instrumentally-accompanied psalmody of the Temple and the simple vocal psalmody of the Synagogue. They assumed that the absence of instruments from the Synagogue was the result of a deliberate legal act and spoke of prohibitions and banishments. Thus Idelsohn: 'But after the Destruction all instrumental music, even for religious purposes, was prohibited, as a sign of national mourning over the Temple.'[13] Two decades later Eric Werner declared similarly: 'The Synagogue had banished all instrumental music without exception as a symbol of mourning over the destruction of the Temple.'[14] Werner, however, went on to assert that the avowed motivation for the ban, mourning over the destruction of the Temple, was specious:

> yet it is clear that the two reasons for the rabbinic opposition to instrumental music were of a quite different nature. Philo and the Sibylline oracles display both contempt for any musical instrument well before the fall of Temple and land. In both cases spiritual worship is regarded as more exalted than any other sensuous ceremonial. Philo, in particular, emphasized the value of spiritual hymns and praises . . . [while] In much stronger terms the Sibyl turns against the pagan type of music.[15]

Werner's prose is occasionally difficult to follow, and before quoting the passages which he cites from Philo and the Sibyl it might help to clarify his argument. He claims here and in subsequent publications[16] that the Rabbis who banned instruments from the Synagogue did so for the same reasons that

Philo and the Sibyl opposed instruments. These reasons were two: a preference for spiritual worship over sensuous ceremonial and an antagonism towards the instruments of pagan orgiastic cults. Philo and the Sibyl shared both motives, but Philo stressed the former and the Sibyl the latter. Finally both Philo and the Sibyl pre-date the destruction of the Temple in AD 70 and hence further discredit the rabbinic claim that instruments were banned as an expression of mourning over the Temple's loss.

We can be comparatively brief in dealing with Philo; Werner clearly regards the Sibylline Oracles as more central to his argument. Philo of Alexandria, of course, was the great Jewish philosopher of the earlier first century whose distinction lay in the application of Greek thought to his Jewish heritage. Like many other philosophers of late antiquity he was in fact an advocate of spiritual worship, but does it follow from this, as Werner claims, that he displayed 'contempt for any musical instrument'[17] and 'strong antagonism to all cymbals and similar noise-making instruments'?[18] To quote the shorter of the two similar passages from Philo which Werner cites:

> O! Master how can anyone sing your praises adequately, with what mouth, with what tongue, with what organization of voice? Can the stars become a chorus and pour forth any melody which shall be worthy of the subject? Even if the whole of the heaven were to be dissolved into voice, would it be able to recount even a portion of your virtues.[19]

Clearly there is no contempt for musical instruments expressed here, indeed no mention of them. What the passage states, simply enough, is that neither human expressions of praise nor even those of the heavens are adequate to their divine object. If one is to draw any inference from this proposition, an unwarranted inference to be sure, it is that vocal music is to be condemned or perhaps that music of the spheres be banned.

Strictly speaking any responsibility for this passage ceases with the demonstration of its inapplicability to Werner's argument; nevertheless it raises questions which must at least be mentioned. There is, for example, the historiographic question of what influenced Werner to so misconstrue Philo.[20] And then there is the broader question of whether a doctrine of spiritual worship has practical implications for an author's views on cult music. Suffice it to say that it is fallacious to conclude that because some philosopher expresses the concept of spiritual worship he thereby renounces the externals of his cult such as animal sacrifice and the instrumental music which regularly accompanied it in antiquity. It is certainly a mistake to claim that Philo did so. He engaged in spiritualization and allegorization not in denigration of the externals of his religion but in defence of them. Indeed in his old age he risked martyrdom to protest the desecration of the Temple.[21]

As suggested above, Werner's invocation of Philo and spiritual worship is somewhat perfunctory; he gives considerably more weight to the following passage from Book VIII of the Sibylline Oracles with its alleged antagonism toward the instruments of pagan orgiastic cults:

> They [the faithful] do not pour blood of sacrifices upon the altar; no *tympanon* is sounded, nor cymbals, nor the *aulos* with its many holes, instruments full of frenzied tones, not the whistling of a pan's pipe is heard, imitating the serpent, nor the trumpet calling to war in wild tones.[22]

It may be difficult to trace the precise line of thought in Werner's commentary on the passage, but his major point is clear enough. The rabbinic antagonism towards the first three instruments mentioned here, the tympanum, the aulos, and the cymbals, stems from their association with the orgiastic cult of Cybele, the *Magna Mater*, and worse still with their use in the similar cult of Zeus Sabazios fostered by renegade Jews of Asia Minor.

There are four points to be made on Werner's use of the passage; the first has to do with the particular instruments of which he takes note. 'The three instruments mentioned' is his phrase. He is correct in associating these three with eastern orgiastic cults; however, the quotation mentions five instruments, including the pan pipe and the trumpet (*salpinx*) along with those he cites. Indeed he breaks off his quotation in mid-period, while the next line but one of the original mentions the kithara, the all-purpose string instrument of antiquity, certainly lacking in special association with orgiastic cults. All told the passage mentions virtually every important instrument of the time and cannot be said to single out those associated with Cybele or Zeus Sabazios.

The second point has to do with his editorial insertion of 'the faithful' as the subject of the period. It is not entirely clear how the insertion forwards his argument, but it is in any case erroneous. The context establishes the subject of the sentence to be not 'the faithful' but the pagan Romans who formerly engaged in the activities described, but no longer do so.

The third point concerns chronology. Werner places the passage 'well before the fall of Temple and land' in AD 70 in order to discount the rabbinic position that instruments were banned because of mourning over the destroyed Temple. In fact, however, a late second century AD date is generally accepted for Book VIII of the Sibylline Oracles; among other indications there is its reference to the Antonine Roman emperors including Marcus Aurelius, who died in AD 180.[23]

The fourth and final point involves Werner's use of the passage as evidence of Jewish antagonism towards instruments. Now it is well known that earlier portions of the Sibylline Oracles are Jewish in origin, but the same unanimity that prevails on the date of Book VIII extends to its identification as a Christian work. To quote, for example, the *Jewish Encyclopedia*: 'Book VIII is still more openly Christian, and includes the famous poem in acrostics to "Jesus Christ, the Redeemer, the crucified Son".'[24]

So much for Werner's evidence; it simply has no bearing on his claims. This is easy enough to demonstrate, but on the other hand he, and along with him Idelsohn, raise a number of difficult questions which cannot be ignored. Was there in fact a ban on instruments in the Synagogue or in Jewish society at large? If there was any sort of instrumental prohibition, what motivated it? And finally, whether there was a legal prohibition or not, were instruments aside from the shofar actually used in the Synagogue? Idelsohn and Werner between

them cite but two passages from the Talmud in support of an instrumental prohibition:

> R. Johanan said: Whoever drinks to the accompaniment of the four musical instruments brings five punishments to the world; as it is stated *Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink; that tarry late into the night that wine inflame them! And the harps, and the lute, the tabret and the pipe, and wine, are in their feasts* (Isa. v, 11–12).[25]

The second, while not as clear perhaps at first reading, is similar in intent:

> An Inquiry was once addressed to Mar Ukba: where does Scripture tell us that it is forbidden (in those times) to sing (at carousals)? He sent back (the following quote) written on lines: *Rejoice not, O Israel, unto exaltation like the peoples for thou has gone astray from thy God* (Hos. ix, 1). Should he not rather have sent the following: *they shall not drink wine with music, strong drink shall be bitter to them that drink it* (Isa. xxiv, 9)? From this verse I should conclude that only musical instruments are forbidden but not song; this I learn (from the other verse).[26]

The last phrase 'from the other verse' is editorial on the part of the translator; it is necessary to the sense of the passage since it refers to the verse from Isaiah which justifies the anti-instrumental conclusion. The verse immediately precedes the one quoted; it reads: 'The mirth of the timbrels is stilled, the noise of the jubilant has ceased, the mirth of the lyre is stilled' (Isa. xxiv, 8).

Do the passages give evidence of a prohibition against instruments? At the outset we can dismiss the notion of a specific ban on instruments in the Synagogue; there is no hint of such in either of the passages. Do they indicate, then, a general prohibition against instruments in Jewish society? Certainly this is much too sweeping a conclusion. For one thing the passages are not from the Mishnah, but from the Gemara of the Babylonian Talmud, a commentary on the Mishnah, redacted in the late fifth century. It is itself a work of great authority, but it violates historical good sense to assume that the moral strictures of individual Rabbis expressed in it are to be equated with laws uniformly observed in Jewish society over the entire Talmudic period. A more important consideration, however, is that both passages, whatever the extent of their authority, have the same narrow and specific object. They do not refer to musical instruments in general, but to their use at the banquet,[27] that omnipresent institution of antiquity in which the well-to-do gather for an elaborate meal, made convivial with wine and musical entertainment. It is to be noted that each passage derives its biblical authority from a verse of the prophet Isaiah, who in turn expressed condemnations similar to those of the Talmudic passages. On each occasion Isaiah denounced those Jewish descendants of nomads who had become rich by accumulating the land of their countrymen and who revelled in the urban pleasures of the Canaanites, most notably extended banquets with much wine and instrumental music. If one may draw upon a Christian parallel, the Church Fathers also made their condemnations of the banquet by way of commentary upon the same passages from Isaiah. To quote but one of the more temperately-worded examples, this from St Ambrose: 'I will not discuss the kithara, the psalterions and tympana, which we

recognize as being frequently used at this type of banquet, in order to stir the passions by both wine and song.'[28]

At this point we have, if not a prohibition in the full sense of the word, at least a condemnation of instruments at banquets by two separate authorities of sufficient importance to be recorded in the Gemara. The Talmudic evidence, however, is not thereby exhausted. There are two additional types of passage insufficiently noted in the secondary sources. The first comprises those which give positive indication of instrumental usage in Jewish life. The Mishnah Kethuboth says of a husband's obligation for his wife's funeral that 'even the poorest man in Israel must furnish not less than two *halilin*'.[29] The Talmud is not quite so direct on the subject of weddings, but one passage speaks of 'hiring *halilin* for a bride and a dead person',[30] another speaks of bells at a wedding,[31] and another of dancing, processions, feasting and song.[32] Finally the Mishnah Sotah speaks of a decree against the playing of drums at weddings during the war with Vespasian. Presumably this was a temporary decree covering the years of that war, AD 67 to 70, and the obvious inference is that drums at weddings were otherwise customary.[33]

The second category of Talmudic evidence involves a question so obvious that one wonders why it has been paid so little attention in the literature; this is the question of a Sabbath prohibition. The evidence suggests strongly that to play a musical instrument was indeed a violation of the Sabbath. The central passage is a long discussion in the tractate Sukkah of whether or not the *halil* might be played in the Temple on the Sabbath. The basic premise to the question is that work which is essential to the Temple service, the lighting of fires to take an obvious example, overrides the Sabbath prohibition. The playing of musical instruments in conjunction with the sacrifice is another legitimate example of such work. And therefore the playing of the regular Temple instruments such as the cymbals, the *nebel* and the *kinnor* is not questioned, only the *halil* which as we have seen was added on twelve special occasions each year. The conclusion is that the *halil* when played in conjunction with the sacrifice is essential and does override the Sabbath, but when played at the Water-Drawing during the festival of Sukkah is a mere expression of rejoicing and does not override the Sabbath.[34] The obvious implication in all of this is that to play a musical instrument under normal circumstances is a violation of the Sabbath. The question was raised even with respect to the shofar, that is, whether it might be blown when Rosh Hashanah fell on a Sabbath. The Mishnah Rosh Hashanah concludes that before the destruction it was blown in the Temple, but not the countryside; after the destruction it was blown wherever there was a court (*beth din*).[35] This question of a Sabbath ban is too fundamental to be settled so easily; it requires the full attention of a Talmudist, but there is at least a prima facie case for the existence of a ban.

What conclusions are to be drawn from this brief survey of Talmudic references? First of all it is quite possible that there was a Sabbath prohibition against playing instruments. On the other hand there was no special ban on instruments in the Synagogue; nor was there a general ban on instruments in

Jewish society. And to raise a new point, the sources display no trace of the vehement animosity towards the instruments themselves which Werner attributes to the period; he goes nearly so far as to rank instruments according to the degree of rabbinic hatred which they aroused.[36] There is only the condemnation of instrumental music at the banquet. What underlies this condemnation? One must at least suggest possibilities. Isaiah's condemnation of similar situations displayed an element of social protest. Was this present in the rabbinic condemnations also? It is not clear from the sources. Perhaps it was transformed into a sense that such ostentatiously indulgent behaviour was unseemly in a nation so tragically reduced by the catastrophic endings to its attempts at revolution against Rome. This may sound similar to mourning over the destruction of the Temple, and indeed that is an idea worthy of more serious treatment than it can be given here. At the very least it should be pointed out that the first of the two rabbinic condemnations appears in commentary upon a Mishnah which declares that 'from the day the Temple was destroyed, there has been no day without a curse' and again 'when the Sanhedrin ceased to exist, song ceased from the places of feasting'.[37]

Another possible motive for the rabbinic condemnation is musical puritanism, that curious tendency among the high-minded of antiquity to associate instrumental music with sexual immorality. St Ambrose's remarks, quoted above, linked musical instruments with arousing the passions and indeed such remarks are a commonplace in the writings of the Church Fathers.[38] Idelsohn made much of this Christian parallel and attributed the same sort of puritanical intensity to the rabbinic authorities.[39] In doing so, I believe, he exaggerated, but that there is some truth in his position follows from the circumstance that the sentence immediately preceding the first of the two rabbinic condemnations reads: 'When men sing and women join in it is licentiousness; when women sing and men join in it is like fire in tow.'[40]

A final motive to be considered is that which Werner stressed; it might be placed in broader perspective by calling it the anti-hellenistic motive, that is a reaction against Greek culture on the part of the other nations of antiquity. Werner's evidence for it was found lacking, yet the same general idea is encountered so frequently in the literature that it cannot be dismissed entirely. My own reaction to it is that there is a peculiar academic prejudice at work here which reduces virtually every issue in antiquity to either an adoption of Greek culture or a conscious rejection of it.[41] In any case the work of Saul Lieberman furnishes a corrective to it. He examined the anti-hellenistic motive with respect to issues other than music – yet furnishing apt analogies to it – and found that while it might have played an important part in the Jewish consciousness at the time of, say, the Hasmonean Revolt, it was no longer particularly active in the first centuries of the Christian era.[42]

* * *

To turn finally from all questions of bans, motives and condemnations, were

musical instruments other than the shofar employed in the Synagogue or were they not? If there was in fact a Sabbatical prohibition, this would rule out their use on the most important day of the Synagogue liturgy. One might be tempted then to dismiss the subject out of hand by pointing to the absurdity of using instruments on ordinary days but not on the solemn Sabbath. This, however, is simplistic; a proper answer to the question must stem from an informed conception of Synagogue music in its liturgical setting, even if this conception cannot equal in precise detail that of the Temple music and liturgy.[43]

One best begin with the standard generalization that the Synagogue liturgy was a revolutionary kind of service which dispensed with the customary ancient rite of animal sacrifice; it consisted rather in a gathering of the community to participate in the reading of Scripture, discourse upon it, prayer, and the singing of psalms. There is no doubt about the first two of these activities: the New Testament vividly demonstrates the role of scriptural reading and public commentary upon it during the time of Jesus, while the Mishnah adds considerable detail. More controversial is the subject of prayer, which involves primarily the recitation of the *Shemah'*, 'Hear, O Israel', and the *Tefillah*, the eighteen benedictions. The *Shemah'* and an early form of the *Tefillah*, consisting in only three benedictions, were indeed recited during the daily Temple service,[44] and the more traditional view would also have them recited in the Synagogue at the time of Jesus. A recent critical view, however, denies the existence of a formal Synagogue liturgy while the Temple still stood; it attributes the establishment of Synagogue liturgy to the late first century AD as a substitute for Temple liturgy.[45] The Mishnah, in any case, presents a nuclear Synagogue liturgy of scriptural recitation, discourse, *Shemah'* and *Tefillah*; it existed by the second century if not by the time of Jesus.[46]

But what of psalmody? To state it as simply as possible, there was no singing of psalms in the ancient Synagogue; the psalmody of the early Synagogue is a myth fostered by a curious coalition of Anglican liturgists and Jewish musicologists. One hastens to add that Jewish liturgical scholars have contributed little if anything to its development. They have had virtually nothing to say on one side or the other of the issue because the primary sources offered them no occasion for doing so.[47] The Anglican liturgical scholars, on the other hand, needed no primary sources; figures like Oesterle, Dix and Dugmore, sympathetic to the idea that the origins of the Christian liturgy were to be sought in the Synagogue, simply assumed that Christian psalmody must have stemmed from Synagogue psalmody.[48] Whatever it was that motivated the claims of the Jewish musicologists, one notes that Werner, without benefit of primary sources, gave precise indications of the specific psalms to be sung at the various Synagogue services.[49]

He ignored the primary sources with good reason. Throughout the entire Talmud there is no indication of daily psalmody in the Synagogue. There is, it is true, evidence that the *Hallel* came to be recited in the Synagogue during the period, primarily on the same festive occasions when it was sung in the Temple. The references, however, give much more the impression of a simple recitation

than a melodious psalmody. Daily psalmody is not evidenced until the tractate Sopherim, redacted probably in the eighth century and reflecting liturgical developments of the post-Talmudic period, that is, after about 500. The text scruples over whether it is permissible to recite the proper daily psalm of the Temple service now that the sacrifice is no longer performed, and answers in the affirmative.[50] Regular Synagogue psalmody, then, is a practice which originated in a period roughly contemporary with that of St Benedict or St Gregory in the west, or perhaps slightly later.

What are the implications of this conclusion for the present study? Have we been dealing all along with a false issue, namely, the exclusion of instruments from a liturgy which, to the extent that it existed at all, existed without music? Certainly many of the positions of Idelsohn and Werner involve false assumptions, but ultimately issues of fundamental importance remain. To appreciate this one must first consider a basic positive point. The recitation of Scripture in the ancient Synagogue was not a dry reading in the modern sense, but rather some sort of elemental declamation or cantilation. The Talmud asserts: 'If one reads the Scripture without a melody or repeats the Mishnah without a tune, of him Scripture says *Wherefore I gave them also statutes that were not good.*'[51] Now the essential activity of the nuclear Christian service, the synaxis, is similarly the recitation of scripture; indeed there is every indication that it is a direct continuation of the Synagogue practice. Moreover this Christian–Jewish nexus extends to psalmody, or rather to its absence. Psalmody is absent not only from the ancient Synagogue, but to propose a second heresy, Christian liturgical psalmody in the formal sense is not a product of the Apostolic age nor of the immediately succeeding centuries, but of the period of the Church's emancipation in the fourth century.[52] Thus both Jewish and Christian psalmody were comparatively late developments which took place without benefit of mutual influence. They had in common that each stemmed in some fashion from scriptural cantilation, but each developed at a time which makes the conventional wisdom of a common origin in Jewish psalmody a chronological absurdity. Any responsible study, therefore, of the relationship between Christian and Jewish liturgical chant must retreat to the solid ground of a commonly practiced scriptural cantilation.

These considerations, finally, place the instrumental issue in proper perspective. It is a legitimate issue for us, but it was not an issue at the time. The Sabbath prohibition aside, all musicological discussion of exclusion or banishment from the synagogue, or for that matter from the church, is beside the point. The truth is that the simple declamation of scripture in synagogue and church, by a non-musician it can be maintained,[53] was a tonal phenomenon to which the sort of instrumental participation required by Temple psalmody was simply irrelevant. This is not to declare absolutely that some individual at some time or another might not have used an instrument in early Synagogue or Church. But there is little evidence to suggest isolated incidents of this sort,[54] no compelling musical motivation for their occurrence to any appreciable extent, and much to be said against them from the demonstrable *a cappella* practice of both later

Synagogue and Church. The *a cappella* issue as opposed to the *a cappella* practice, that is the tendency to think in terms of legal exclusions and the like, is a different matter. It arose in both Judaism and Christianity many centuries after the fact, apparently from observing the contrast between a highly-developed vocal music within the sacred precincts and an elaborate instrumental music without. That, however, belongs to a much later chapter than the present one in the history of this issue which impinges upon our music from antiquity to the present.

NOTES

1 The psalms are given in Tamid VII, 4: Sunday, Ps. 24; Monday, Ps. 48; Tuesday, Ps. 82; Wednesday, Ps. 94; Thursday, Ps. 81; Friday, Ps. 93; Sabbath, Ps. 92.
2 See Sol Baruch Finesinger, 'Musical Instruments in OT', *Hebrew Union College Annual*, iii (1926), 21–75.
3 M. 'Arakin II, 3, 5, 6.
4 M. 'Arakin II, 6.
5 The use of *pereq* is puzzling here; the context indicates clearly that it refers to a portion of a psalm whereas normally in the Talmud it refers to an entire psalm.
6 There may have been as many as eighteen if one includes Hannukah; see Solomon Zeitlin, 'The Hallel', *Jewish Quarterly Review*, liii (1962), 22–9.
7 M. 'Arakin II, 3.
8 Finesinger, 'Musical Instruments', 48–52; he identifies the *halil* with the aulos, but uses the anachronistic term flute.
9 M. 'Arakin II, 3.
10 Compare M. 'Arakin II, 3 and M. Pesahim V, 7.
11 M. Sukkah V, 4.
12 M. Rosh Hashanah III, 2–7; IV, 1–2, 5–9.
13 Abraham Z. Idelsohn, *Jewish Music in Its Historical Development* (New York, 1929), p. 93; see also pp. 96–7.
14 *The Sacred Bridge* (New York, 1959), p. 318; see also Alfred Sendry, *Music in Ancient Israel* (New York, 1969), p. 182.
15 *Sacred Bridge*, p. 334.
16 *New Oxford History of Music*, i (London, 1957), 315; '"If I Speak in the Tongues of Men" . . . St Paul's Attitude to Music', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, xiii (1960), 20.
17 *Sacred Bridge*, p. 334.
18 'St Paul's Attitude to Music', p. 20.
19 *De vita Moysis*, ii, 239; trans., C. D. Yonge, *The Works of Philo Judaeus*, iii (London, 1855), 124; the second passage is *De spec. leg.*, i, 271.
20 Apparently he follows, without attribution, Johannes Quasten, *Musik und Gesang in den Kulten der heidnischen Antike und christlichen Frühzeit*. Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen, xxv (Münster, 1930), 71–77; the argument is similar and the citations are identical.
21 On this aspect of Philo see Henry A. Wolfson, *Philo* (Cambridge, Mass., 1947), i, 85–6.
22 As quoted in *Sacred Bridge*, p. 334; for the original see Johannes Geffcken, *Die Oracula Sibyllina* (Leipzig, 1902), pp. 147–8 (lines 113–17).
23 See Johannes Geffcken, *Kompositions und Entstehungszeit der Oracula Sibyllina*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, N.F. viii, 1 (Leipzig, 1902), 38–46. The standard reference works follow Geffcken.
24 Samuel Krauss, 'Sibyl', *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, xi (New York, 1905), 323. The passage in question does express Christian antagonism to a broad spectrum of pagan cults with their prominent instrumental usage, but that is another matter.

25 Sotah 48a; Soncino, 258. The passage is from the Gemara of the Talmud, a commentary upon the Mishnah, written in Aramaic as opposed to the Hebrew of the Mishnah. Gemara translations are taken from the Soncino Press translation of the Babylonian Talmud, published at London from 1934 to 1960, and cited as above.
26 Gittin 7a; Soncino, 22. The parentheses in the Soncino translations are editorial.
27 Boaz Cohen would make the object of the Sotah passage even more specific, the wedding banquet; *Law and Tradition in Judaism* (New York, 1959), p. 167.
28 *De elia et jejunia*, xv; *Patrologia Latina*, xiv: 752.
29 M. Kethuboth IV, 4; see also M. Shabbath XXIII, 4.
30 M. Baba Mezia VI, 1.
31 Baba Bathra 145b.
32 Kethuboth 8a; see also Kethuboth 17a.
33 M. Sotah IX, 14; see also Sotah 49b and Niddah 61b. There is also a difficult passage involving thousands of trumpets at wedding and funeral processions: Kethuboth 17a.
34 M. Sukkah V, 1; Sukkah 50b–51a.
35 M. Rosh Hashanah IV, 1.
36 'St. Paul's Attitude', 19–20; *Sacred Bridge*, p. 335.
37 M. Sotah IX, 12, 11.
38 See James W. McKinnon, 'The Meaning of the Patristic Polemic against Musical Instruments', *Current Musicology* (Spring, 1965), pp. 69–82.
39 *Jewish Music*, pp. 92–9.
40 Sotah 48a; Soncino, 257–8. See also Berakoth 24a.
41 The prejudice is rampant, for example, in Hermann Abert's influential *Die Musikanschauung des Mittelalters und ihre Grundlagen* (Halle, 1905).
42 See especially 'The Alleged Ban on Greek Wisdom' and 'Rabbinic Polemics against Idolatry', *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York, 1950), pp. 100–14, 115–27.
43 What follows is an extremely cursory summary of a study in progress by the author, 'The Myth of Psalmody in Early Synagogue and Church'.
44 M. Tamid V, 1.
45 The literature is summarized in Joseph Gutmann, ed., *The Synagogue: Studies in Origins, Archaeology and Architecture* (New York, 1975).
46 Perhaps the central passages of the many referring to Synagogue liturgy are those of M. Megillah III and IV.
47 An exception must be noted; the position is very close to that expressed in this paper: Louis I. Rabinowitz, 'The Psalms in Jewish Liturgy', *Historia Judaica*, vi (1944), 109–22.
48 W. O. E. Oesterle, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy* (London, 1925), p. 73; Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London, 1945), p. 39; Clifford W. Dugmore, *The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office* (London, 1944), pp. 8, 80.
49 *Sacred Bridge*, pp. 7–10, 144–5.
50 Sopherim XVIII–XX; additional psalms are designated for certain occasions.
51 Megillah 32a; Soncino, 194.
52 The sources are collected and analysed in the study referred to in note 43.
53 The same study reviews the evidence which shows the Christian cantor to be a development of the fourth century and the Jewish cantor of a still later period.
54 The only argument I am aware of for an occasional use of instruments in the Synagogue is in Sendry, *Music of Ancient Israel*, 182; it is based on an unwarranted interpretation of M. Erubin X, 13. A more sophisticated, if not ultimately acceptable, case for their use in early Christianity is made by John Foster, 'The Harp at Ephesus', *The Expository Times*, lxxix (1962–63), 156.